

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 and 7-22 are now presented in the application.

The amendment filed after final office action was not entered based on the language added to claim 1 as raising a new issue since it differed from claim 6 and as introducing new matter. The language added to claim 1 recited “a combination of a first hydrophilic polymer and a second hydrophilic polymer, wherein said first hydrophilic polymer and said second hydrophilic polymer have different structures”. Claim 6 recited “wherein at least two species of the hydrophilic polymers having different structures are used in combination”. Notwithstanding the filing of a RCE, applicant respectfully submits that the term “species” as used in claim 6 refers to polymers, since the word species means a kind or sort of something and therefore a kind of a polymer must also be a polymer. Moreover the term added to claim 1 is not new matter since the specification clearly discloses using two hydrophilic polymers having different structures. For instance, please see paragraph [0034] and Examples in the specification.

In view of the above and the response filed after final office action dated November 6, 2009, consideration and allowance are respectfully solicited.

In the event the Examiner believes that another interview might serve in any way to advance the prosecution of this application, the undersigned is available at the telephone number noted below.

Application No.: 10/585,305
Reply filed with RCE

Docket No.: 21581-00443-US

The Office is authorized to charge any necessary fees to Deposit Account No. 22-0185, under Order No. 21581-00443-US from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: January 5, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By: / Burton A. Amernick/

Burton A. Amernick

Registration No.: 24,852

CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP

1875 Eye Street, NW

Suite 1100

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 331-7111

(202) 293-6229 (Fax)

Attorney for Assignee